UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,560	01/14/2002	Katsumi Adachi	SAEG102.001AUS	4973

7590 10/21/2003

McDermott Will & Emery
600 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, JENNIFER T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	8

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/047,560	ADACHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer T Nguyen	2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (Pub. No.: US 2003/0030618) in view of Burbank (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,822).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, referring to Figs. 1 and 8, Jones teaches an image display device comprising: a first storage device (16) for storing an image data; an image processing device (12) for reducing the number of bits of the image data; a display device (26) for displaying the image data after being processed; a display drive device (not shown) for driving the display device (26); and a control device (110) for controlling the operation of the display drive device, wherein the control device (11) determines whether the image data stored in the first storage device (16) is dynamic or static (pages 1, 2, and 4, paragraphs [0005], [0006], [0010], [0011], [0025], [0027], [0029], [0033]-[0035], [0048], [0049], and [0053]).

Jones differs from claims 1 and 2 in that he does not specifically teach a second storage device for storing the image data after being processed; in the case of a static image, after storing the signals corresponding to one frame of the image data in the second storage device, operates only the second storage device, the display drive device and the image display device. However, referring to Fig. 1, Burbank teaches a second storage device (i.e., static image driver and dynamic image driver) for storing the image data after being processed; in the case of a static image, after storing the signals corresponding to one frame of the image data in the second storage device, operates only the second storage device, the display drive device and the image display device (see abstract, from col. 2, line 58 to col. 4, line 33 and from col. 4, lines 61 to col. 5, line 35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the second storage device for storing the image data after being processed; in the case of a static image, after storing the signals corresponding to one frame of the image data in the second storage device, operates only the second storage device, the display drive device and the image display device as taught by Burbank in the system of Jones in order to reduce energy consumption.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Jones and Burbank teaches the second storage device and the display drive device are united into one body by disposing them on the same chip (from col. 2 of Burbank, line 58 to col. 4, line 33).

Regarding claim 4, Jones further teaches the image processing device processes the image data by a dither method (page 2, paragraphs [0029] and [0033]).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Jones and Burbank further teaches the image processing device reduces the total number of bits of the three elements (RGB) contained in the

image data in such a manner that (pages 1 and 2 of Jones, paragraphs [0005], [0006], [0010], [0011], [0025], [0027], [0029], [0033]-[0035]).

The combination of Jones and Burbank differs from claim 5 in that it does not specifically teach after conducting the image processing, the number of G bits becomes the largest and the number of B bits becomes the smallest. However, it would have been obvious to obtain after conducting the image processing, the number of G bits becomes the largest and the number of B bits becomes the smallest in order to prevent roughness of image surface in dither process, thereby a high quality image can be maintained.

Regarding claim 8, Jones further teaches the image display device is a liquid crystal panel (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (Pub. No.: US 2003/0030618) in view of Burbank (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,822) and further in view of Uya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,530,797).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Jones and Burbank differs from claim 6 in that it does not specifically teach a switching device for switching between the dynamic image processing device and the static image processing device and by operating the switching device according to that determination, if the image data is that of a dynamic image, the dynamic image processing device is made to process the image data, and if the image data is that of a static image, the static image processing device is made to process the image data. However, referring to Fig. 8, Uya teaches a switching device (6) for switching between the dynamic image processing device and the static image processing device and by operating the switching device (6) according to that determination, if the image data is that of a dynamic image, the dynamic

image processing device is made to process the image data, and if the image data is that of a static image, the static image processing device is made to process the image data (col. 2, lines 3-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the switching device for switching between the dynamic image processing device and the static image processing device and by operating the switching device according to that determination, if the image data is that of a dynamic image, the dynamic image processing device is made to process the image data, and if the image data is that of a static image, the static image processing device is made to process the image data as taught by Uya in the system of the combination of Jones and Burbank in order to reduce power consumption while maintaining high image quality.

Regarding claim 7, Jones further teaches the dynamic image processing device processes the image by an FRC method, and the static image processing device processes the image by a dither method (page 2, paragraphs [0029] and [0033]).

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Minakuchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,640,175) teaches dynamic display device.

Choi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,346) teaches element generator for dither matrix.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jennifer T. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-3225.** The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reach at **703-305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, sixth-floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Jennifer T. Nguyen
10/11/2003

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600